R E M A R K S

The present amendment is in response to the Official Action dated May 8, 2006, in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 8-14 and 16-21 as being unpatentable over Selby, US Patent No. 4,876,738, in view of one or more of Chen et al., US Patent No. 6,922,561; Purnadi et al., US Patent No. 6,708,031; Frid et al., US Patent No. 6,560,239; and Lawrence, US Patent No. 6,628,935. The Examiner further objected to claims 12-14 and 16-21 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention, largely focusing on language specific to claim 12 and implicating the remaining claims through their dependency upon claim 12. However contrary to the Examiner's assertions, the claims are patentable over the references the Examiner relies upon in support of the rejection.

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner has correctly identified that Selby, '738, minimally fails to teach associating each communication area with one of a plurality of paging groups, associating and registering with a different paging group, and a paging group area detect module. However contrary to the assertions of the Examiner, Chen et al., '561, fails to account for the noted deficiencies, such as where the paging group area detect module detects the wireless communication device entering a new paging group area. Alternatively, Chen et al., '561, detects a number of cells in a current cell list which reaches a predetermined limit (see col. 10, lines 1-5), which may or may not coincide with detection of an entry into a new paging area.

For example, using the illustrated cell pattern in FIG. 12, and the example in the text where the predetermined limit equals 3 (see col. 10, lines 25-30). Presumably, the paging area includes cell A1 (cell location where MS last registered), B1 through B6, and C1 through C12 (see col. 10, line 67 to col. 11, line 3), which are within an area centered at A1 and extended by a predetermined number of cells MAX_NUM_CELLS (i.e. 3) less one (i.e. 2). In fact given such a definition, the current cell list will generally reach the predetermined number of cells prior to actually leaving the paging area, because an entry into the C-Ring of cells will generally result in the current cell list including at least the centered A cell, one of the B cells, and one of the C cells (unless the path retraces a cell which was moved to the previous cell list). Entry into the C-Ring will trigger a new registration despite the fact that the mobile device has not yet left the old paging area, and consequently the reference can not be said to make known a new paging area detect module. Consequently, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Chen et al., '561, fails to

account for the acknowledged deficiencies of Selby, '738, and therefore fails to make known or obvious claims 1 or 12, and/or any of the claims, which depend therefrom.

Furthermore, with respect to claim 11, and the Examiner's assertion that Lawrence, '935, makes known the deletion of messages upon a change in power states, upon review of the reference, such an assertion can not be supported, nor does the teaching relate to a context consistent with the claimed invention, as noted previously. More specifically, contrary to the assertions of the Examiner, Lawrence, '935, fails to teach the deletion of messages, but alternatively teaches the deactivation of a memory exceed indicator (see col. 2, lines 12-34). In the particular embodiment discussed, even though the memory exceed indicator is deactivated upon power up, if undeliverable messages are subsequently detected the memory exceed indicator will be re-activated (see col. 6, lines 16-40).

Furthermore the teachings of the reference relate to a system associated with SMS type paging messages, which are not the same as registration information associated with a previous presence in a new area. Even if the reference were to teach the deletion of a message upon power up, which it does not, the Examiner is not allowed to allege a teaching which goes beyond the actual teaching. In other words the nexus has not been shown between an e-mail type textual message sent to a user and registration information. The Examiner is not allowed to expand the teaching beyond what the reference actually teaches, through the use of creative re-labeling of the elements associated with the actual teaching (a re-labeling that is not part of the language of the original reference). Nevertheless, the Examiner can not even show that any information is deleted upon power up (even the memory exceed indicator is not deleted, alternatively its value is only changed). As a result, the reference can not be said to make known or obvious each and every feature of claim 11.

Regarding the alleged failure to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention, the applicant has amended the language to more clearly associate the specific portion of the claim language identified by the examiner as relating to the retained registration information from a prior presence in the new area.

The applicants continue to acknowledge the Examiner's failure to approve the new drawings, filed on April 24, 2006, and presumably their non-entry. The applicants further understand that the prosecution will proceed based upon the original informal drawings,

originally submitted at the time of filing the application, until if and when new formal drawings correcting the noted informalities are submitted.

In view of the above noted analysis, the presently articulated rejections can not be maintained, and in absence of a valid rejection, the claims should be correspondingly allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

BY:/Lawrence Chapa/
Lawrence J. Chapa
Reg. No. 39,135
Phone (847) 523-0340
Fax. No. (847) 523-2350

Motorola, Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
600 North US Highway 45, W4-35Q
Libertyville, IL 60048